

Comments from ISM Workshop December 5-6, 2000

1. Too many speeches from Senior Management who had nothing germane to say. They tended to be off subject and rambling. It looked as if they were here just to be seen. The best information came from the workers and researchers, and not management. The INEEL union guy at the end had the best inspirational talks.
2. Most everything about the conference facilities was good. However chairs were so close together it was uncomfortable and even difficult to take notes due to minimal space to move your arms. Pine/Oak/Spruce rooms were too small for the audience.  
  
Liked moderator directed panel discussions – should have shorter presentations and more time for questions. Should have had recycle bins for cans/bottles for beverages consumed during workshop.
3. Nice workshop – a couple suggestions: Hold speakers to time allotment; hesitation to do that (even for senior management/Regulator Speakers) distorts “balance” and irritates and WRECKS the flow of the event. Site-specific “culture” is invasive it distorts competitions outcomes. OTHERWISE – Really well done, well planned informational, executed smooth! Thanks, Jim, et.al.
4. Strength - Workers involvement message Scientific (National Labs) perspectives not well represented and are a little different.
5. Good format of real panel discussions / moderated sessions  
Idea for next ISM workshop – focus each track on ISM integrations issues:  
Safeguards/security (ISMS)                      Quality  
Chem Safety    Env. / Pollution Prevention  
Next conference: mandated attire - no ties/suits allowed (to break down barriers between workers and management). Hotel staff was GREAT! Next Conference: more focus (a track) on ISM issues at the Labs.
6. Workshop speakers need to be kept to their time limits. Profanity should not be used by any speaker during presentations, even as part of a joke.
7. Like Wednesday afternoon Environmental Panel question and answer session. Get the Idaho guy with the red and blue hat on video – he makes an everyday guy positive statement.
8. Conference chairs would fail an ergonomic assessment miserable. Presentations by actual workers were excellent. Most presenters, other than workers, spent way too much time talking history and wrong turns rather than results. Workers involvement panel had far too many managers and only one union president representing the workers. This panel needed to have workers as the panel. Track A room too small and very warm panel

format good. Appreciated viewpoints of regulators and manager groups. Summary sessions were terrible. Focus was on who presented what rather than lessons learned or exemplary items.

9. Most valuable sessions dealt with upcoming issues: 2000-2; E013148; QA rule revision. Cut workshop to 1-½ days, crossword puzzle was fun. Workshop folder package was helpful. Track report could have been done after workshop (seems like time filler) hotel was good choice. Moderated panels better, but were “canned”. Many presentations ran over on time – the last speakers were “cheated” on time and interest. Presentations made by union/crafts people were very interesting. Workshop agenda was well prepared – good variety of topics. Too much emphasis on EM – First session was of limited use 2<sup>nd</sup> session was more useful.
10. Need copies or access to speaker notes (posted on web site). Track C did not provide a list of performance measures/indicators. It would be helpful to know what measures / indicators that DOE uses. I did not hear much about the environmental part of ISM. DOE 970-5204-2 includes environmental aspect is taking a back seat to safety. Panel discussions were great!
11. Needed larger rooms. Run the Red Bead Experiment more – unable to attend! Tuesday Senior Management Panel was way too long!!!
12. (Q3) – Time limits should have been enforced! (Q15) SNL always defined the “S” in ISMS to include “E”; needed more time and or space to see other breakout sessions of interest. Would like to have learned what will happen to SMIT.
13. Some of the room could not hold interested participants poor planning.
14. Senior Management Panel on first day ran over significantly – presenters should have been held to their time limits. Some rooms were too small to accommodate all the people.
15. The worker involvement/management panel discussion was used for folks to promote their agendas, not to build common understanding.
16. Track E – Stakeholder involvement – **A.**
17. Might mark (\*) the topics/classes/sessions that give team points away!
18. The strong emphasis of worker involvement throughout the workshop is extremely encouraging. It is good to know management realizes workers have a valuable contribution to make.
19. Once again, I heard a lot of the good things people are doing and how successful certain programs have been. Still not much on the failures / inadequate programs / less than

effective programs. Too much “horn tooting”! What are the opportunities for improvement?

20. Consider the total registration number (of people) next time and plan breakout rooms appropriately; Tuesday’s sessions were quite crowded for some sessions.
21. Reduce breakout sessions to 45 mi. / 15 min breaks even if that means having more than five BO sessions. Format breakout sessions as panel discussions to increase interaction.
22. Schedule was destroyed first thing Tuesday; sessions on Tuesday were too long sitting at one time. Senior management panel was too big for time available. The format used by the Wednesday AM panel was EXCELLENT! This form of questions and answers should be used for breakout session discussions INSTEAD of standup presentations.
23. Need better (timely) preparation of breakout rooms. Bronze, Silver and gold rooms almost too large to facilitate good communications.
24. Poor planning and lack of discipline in speaker control resulted in a total inability to stay on schedule. Try to eliminate redundancy in material presented.
25. Joe DiNunno talked too high level for this audience.
26. Too long for Plenary and Senior Management Panel. The message was too simple to require so long to deliver. This is not a negative comment for the organizers, but for the senior management.
27. Plenary session was too lengthy. Senior Management Board session was too lengthy. Pine Room (A session) was too small.
28. Schedule was blown early on.
29. Temperature controls did not exist – hot and cold seemed to be extremes. I would like more time for exhibits.
30. 2000- 2 recommendations needs to have a one to two day meeting to fully describe how each site implements the program (for consistency).
31. Excellent Workshop
32. (Q#9) I felt the feedback was negative, which is opposite for m what we are trying to achieve. Plus it categorized individuals as “above normal” or “below normal” which I took as degrading, and if you which to achieve ISMS to be successful, 1<sup>st</sup> step is to take this frame of mind out. Over all I took lots of useful information in and felt that the people that put it all together did a fantastic job – hands down – I applaud you.
33. Pine room too small for presentations – could not get into room.

34. Exhibits present, but no time in program to attend. Many breakout sessions were where I wanted to be but only one at a time. I would rather see a more extensive program with a single – theme and all hearing same thing!
35. I am taking home more ideas, and knowledge than I expected. This was time well spent!
36. Methods for Effective Communications (technology) was very interesting and extremely well presented – a very good explanation of a much-needed set of tools. Jan Wachtel gave a very excellent presentation! So did Mark Coronado in his presentation of RL Management Systems (RIMS). DOE did a wonderful job making this session beneficial to all. Session B-4 was excellent!!!
37. No time set aside to browse the exhibits. Temperature control problems in exhibit room.
38. Rooms for breakout – perhaps we can “pool” the registrants to see interest and size room to projected attendance. More time perhaps breaks, after hours for exhibits.